arXiv:0902.0664v1 [q-bio.OT] 4 Feb 2009

A mathematical model to describe "context-dependence" in Biology

Anirban Banerji

Bioinformatics Centre, University of Pune

Pune-411007, Maharashtra, India.

anirban@bioinfo.ernet.in,anirbanab@gmail.com

February 4, 2009

Abstract

Context-dependent nature of biological phenomena are well documented in every branch of biology. While there have been few previous attempts to (implicitly) model various facets of biological context-dependence, a formal and general mathematical construct to model the wide spectrum of context-dependence, eludes the students of biology. An objective and rigorous model, from 'bottom-up' and 'top-down' perspective is proposed here to describe the various kinds of context-dependence that we encounter in different branches of biology. Care has been taken at every step to match the assumptions with experimentally obtained data, so that the biological relevance of this model is not compromised to maintain its mathematical rigor. Rules of interactions and dependencies between biological contexts have been proposed too. It is found that a hierarchic nature of dependence amongst the biological contexts models the biological nature best.

Keywords : Context-dependence, interactions amongst biological contexts, hierarchic nature of contextual dependencies, mathematical model, bottom-up view, top-down view.

'Context-dependence' is omnipresent in Biology. From the realm of substitution of nucleotides[1,2] to the paradigm of protein structure-function[3], from the sphere of cellular dynamics[4] to that in evolutionary dynamics[5], one encounters events and processes that are 'context-dependent' in copious amount. While various attempts have been made from differing perspectives to somehow quantify context-sensitiveness of particular biological events [6], a general mathematical framework that attempts to capture and describe ubiquitous 'context-dependence' eludes the students of Biology. In the present work, such a mathematical structure is proposed that attempts to model the ubiquitous 'context-dependence' from bottom-up as well as top-down perspectives.

We suggest the triad of the form '<Structure of biological goals(F), Biological contexts (C), Physical structure of the system (P)>, ($< F, C, P >$), to describe the structure of any biological process. Components of this triad are by no means independent; F determines the suitable choice of C; while C, in its turn, operates upon some particular subset of P with definite features. To ensure F is achieved, C engages only certain elements of P. It is important to mention that same physical structures can be subjected to different contexts to achieve different biological goals; for example, same proteins under different set of contexts (the state of the biological system and protein localization) may be involved in different biological processes, so that the different goals of these processes are achieved. [7]. It assumes importance to note here that the present approach is different both in its motivation and mathematical formalism from an earlier

work [8] that had attempted to model the network of biological interactions. Our work attempts to formulate the general and formal principles of contextual interactions by modeling the nature the dependencies between biological contexts, which operate upon physical (structural) parameters, to ensure that any particular biological goal is achieved.

Since the motivation of any biological process is solely to accomplish the necessary biological goals and the structure of biological goals is hierarchic [9,10]; we propose a hierarchic organizational structure for biological contexts too. Thus, structure of C will assume that of a tree (namely the 'Context-Tree'(CT)), where the root-vertex will denote the global context whose achievement is caused by the underlying contexts. The lowest level of CT will be occupied by basic, elementary contexts (- for example, the genes themselves, where a systematic combination of the molecular function of their products (proteins) is studied with respect to achieving a specific biological goal[9]), and their set $A = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}$ will constitute the base of CT. This form of structure for S, lends itself well for analyzing the measure of performance of any context to actualize any particular F, in the form $\frac{\partial F}{\partial a_i}$. Every context, including the global context, may be obtained as a composition of these basic contextual elements of CT. However, to accomplish a definite set of biological goals, the contexts describing various facets of a biological system need to interact between themselves. We can define a set of rules U ($U = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n\}$) that governs the framework for composition between the base elements of CT, denoted by α. We note here that set U might be infinite, and the compositions $a_i \alpha a_j$ with $\alpha \in U$ need not necessarily be defined for all $a_i, a_j \in A$.

The importance of set U is paramount, because it is this set that governs how the various elements of S will interact to construct the CT and eventually achieve F. Let us assign to each element α of the set U, an $n \times n$ incidence matrix [11] A^{α} with entries a_{ij}^{α} is unity if the composition $a_i \alpha a_j$ is defined, or zero otherwise. We can then introduce a matrix A^U whose elements are given as :

$$a_{ij} = \bigvee_{\alpha \in U} a_{ij}^{\alpha} \tag{1}$$

stating that $a_{ij} = 1$ if there exists a valid composition rule between a_i and a_j, taken in order.

Matrix A^U conforms to constraints of biological reality perfectly because it suggests that for certain magnitudes of i, the i^{th} row and i^{th} column of the matrix A^U can be all zeros. These cases imply that interactions between certain basic elements of context-set $A = \{a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n\}$ are not allowable biologically. We demonstrate such non-allowable biological contexts with two examples :

Example-1) When λ phage (a virus that infects the bacteria *Escherichia coli*) encounters a bacterium, it attaches itself only to certain particular receptors with specific structural features, on the bacterial membrane. That is, the relevant biological contexts ensure that binding of λ phage to various other candidate receptor sites with slightly varying structural aspects, is not allowed. Subsequently, when the virus genome enters the bacterium, only two pathways (out of theoretically infinite number of pathways) of alternative nature, namely the 'lytic pathway' or the 'lysogenic pathway' are allowed biologically[8]. Again, it is the pertinent contexts which forbids the existence of any other pathways, although a theoretical thermodynamic study of the situation can suggest many possible pathways with (almost) similar efficiencies.

Example-2) Out of the entire spectrum of possible mRNAs that can be generated from a single gene, only one or a few are created at a time; biological contexts do not allow the other possibilities to come into being, although these theoretically possible contexts would have operated upon the same structural parameters. The set of allowable contexts to achieve this particular goal form the so-called 'regulatory mechanism' that includes an extremely sensitive balance between concentration magnitudes of pertinent entities, the destination, sequence variety, structural diversity and finally the functional options of the resulting protein related to the type of tissue or the stage of development, etc.. [12].

Henceforth, there are no corresponding rules to describe the biological impossibilities in U. In other words, these compositions cannot participate in the construction of the tree CT. Removing these aforementioned entries, from the set A we obtain a non-redundant set of basic rules of context composition. From here onwards, we will denote this non-redundant set by set A.

We can now attempt to describe a biological process of transportation. We assume three elements $\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ from the set of basic contexts A. We denote a_1 as the context for loading, a_2 for delivery and a_3 for unloading. To provide an example, we consider the case when axon of a neuron transports the transmission of action potentials from the cell body to the synapse. The complicated mechanism of action potential propagation and their active transportation from their site of synthesis in the cell body through the axoplasm to intracellular target sites in the axon and synapse, - provides an ideal case to demonstrate the various context-specific activities. Here The loading and delivery contexts (a_1 and a_2 respectively) involves the series synchronized cou-

plings between allowed set of specific membranous organelles, synaptic vesicle precursors, signaling molecules, growth factors, protein complexes, cytoskeletal components, sodium and potassium channels and many other biological components. On the other hand, the unloading context (a_3) describes the neurotrophic signals that are transported back from the synapse to the cell body, keeping an account of efficiency and reliability of loading and delivery operations[13]. Here we introduce the set of compositional rules U. U may then operate upon these three basic elements to ensure a sequential execution of elementary processes to ensure that final goal (F) is achieved. In this case the matrix A^U can be written as :

$$\begin{array}{cccc} & a_1 & a_2 & a_3 \\ a_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a_2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ a_3 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{array} \tag{2}$$

Hence the elementary biological context, α, is defined for only two cases from the entire spectrum of possible contextual interactions; they are $a_2 \alpha a_1$ (implying the existence of a pipeline where context for delivery comes into action after the context for loading is ensured) and $a_3 \alpha a_2$ (implying the existence of context for unloading after the operation of context for delivery is performed). It is interesting to note that a pipeline with $a_3 \alpha a_1$ is not biologically relevant, since it implies the existence of context for unloading after the context for loading without any delivery action. Similarly contextual relations like $a_1 \alpha a_1$ (loading certain contexts repeatedly without a purpose), $a_1 \alpha a_2$ (existence of the context to ensure delivery when the initiation of the process is not ensured), $a_2 \alpha a_3$ (context to ensure unloading when the delivery process is incomplete) and other spurious context-relations like $a_2 \alpha a_2$, $a_3 \alpha a_3$ are assigned a magnitude zero because they

are biological impertinent. On a global scale, the composition $a_3 \alpha a_2 \alpha a_1$ captures the purposeful nature of biological goals.

The findings of the last paragraph implies that interactions between biological contexts, are transitive but are not commutative (since $a_3 \alpha a_2$ and $a_2 \alpha a_1$ are defined, $a_3 \alpha a_2 \alpha a_1$ can be defined; but merely because $a_3 \alpha a_2$ exists doesn't imply that $a_2 \alpha a_3$ exists too). The non-commutative nature of biological contexts can be understood better from the general treatment of the problem elaborated later.

The (bottom-up) paradigm of description of interplay of biological contexts can be generalized by describing the entire biological universe with the Thread-Mesh (TM) model[14]. The TM model segments the biological space-time into a series of different biological organizations, viz. the nucleotides; amino acids; macromolecules (proteins, sugar polymers, glycoproteins); biochemical networks; biological cell; tissue; organs; organisms; society and ecosystem; where these organizational schemes are called threshold levels. Emergence of a single biological property (compositional or functional) creates a new biological threshold level in the TM model. Thus, if any arbitrarily chosen i^{th} biological threshold level is denoted as $\mathbf{TH}_i$, $\mathbf{TH_{i+1}}$ will be containing at least one biological property that $\mathbf{TH_i}$ didn't possess. Somewhat similar schemes of identification of biological threshold levels is neither new [15,16] nor unique and there can be many other intermediary threshold levels too (considering the fact that existence of one emergent thread distinguishes $\mathbf{TH_{i+1}}$ from $\mathbf{TH_i}$). For example, at high resolution one can consider the secondary, tertiary, quaternary structures too as separate threshold levels that exist between amino acids and the proteins. The basic principles for subsequent discourse, however, are general and can be

applied to any threshold level. Every possible property that a threshold level is endowed with, is represented by a 'thread' in the TM model. Thus an environmental property capable of influencing biological action will be called as an 'environmental thread' in the present parlance. Threads can be compositional, structural or functional. For example, for the biological threshold level corresponding to the enzymes (threshold level representing the macromolecules), one of the compositional threads is the amino acid sequence; whereas the radius of gyration, the resultant backbone dipole moment and each of the bond lengths, bond angles, torsion angles are some examples of structural threads and the values for K_m, V_{max}, K_{cat} are some examples of it's functional threads.

To describe the 'Context-Tree'(CT) in such hierarchic paradigm in a general manner, we introduce a construct C, which is a family of embedded partitions of contexts $C =< C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^r >$ that operate upon any relevant subset of structural threads (J) representing the physical structure (P) of any arbitrarily chosen threshold level S. $J \subset P$ and $J = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. For example, it has been found [3] that at the threshold level of proteins; (S=Threshold Proteins) in an urea-induced media (the 'environmental thread' influencing J), the extent of stability of mutant proteins are highly dependent on the contexts (C) which operate upon the various structural parameters (J), that form a subset of (P) describing (S).

We can describe the situation as :

$$C^S =< C_1^S, C_2^S, \ldots, C_l^S > \quad \cup_{j=1}^{l} C_j^S = J, \quad C_i^S \cap C_j^S = \emptyset \, (i \neq j) \, , \; S = \overline{1,\, r} \quad (3)$$

The embedding refers to any element of the partition of the s^{th} biological threshold level; i.e., the set C_j^s represents the union of several sets $C_{i_1}^{S-1}, C_{i_2}^{S-1}, \ldots, C_{i_z}^{S-1}$ of the $(S-1)^{th}$ biological threshold level. Such description of (CT) conforms to a previous study on similar topic [6]. Findings from a recent study[17] vindicates $C_i^S \cap C_j^S = \emptyset$. To elaborate the hierarchic structure, we can write $C \longleftrightarrow < C_1^{S-1}, C_2^{S-1}, \ldots, C_l^{S-1} >$, if $C^S = \cup_{i=1}^{l} C_i^{S-1}$. Since the entire set of interactions between various contexts is ultimately to satisfy biological goals and since the nature of organization of biological goals can also be assumed to be hierarchic, we attempt to describe it by defining $l\left(C^S\right) = l$ and $C^{root} =< \{1, 2, \ldots, m\} >$; i.e., the partition at the highest (root) level consists of one set, namely J.

We can associate each element $C_j^S \quad \left(s = \overline{2,\ r}\right)$ of the partition to the context-interaction function, namely $f_j^S\left(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_{l\left(C_j^S\right)}\right)$, where $\alpha \in \{0, -1, +1\}$, conforming to the previously defined $U\,(U = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n\})$. We associate each element C_j^1 of the first level to a binary relation R_j(the previously defined elementary contexts are related by this, say aRb, where $A = \{a, b, \ldots, z\}$) on the biological sub-space EC_j^1.

These concepts can formally be described as :
Let $C_j^2 \longleftrightarrow < C_1^1, \ldots, C_l^1 >$ and define a relation R_j^2 on $E_{C_j^2}$ using the formula (for $l > 1$) :

$$a_{C_j^2} R^2_{bC_j^2} \Longleftrightarrow f_j^2\left(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_l\right) = 1 \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i &= +1 \quad if\ a_{C_i^1} R_i b_{C_i^1} \\
\alpha_i &= -1 \quad if\ a_{C_i^1} \overline{R} b_{C_i^1} \\
\alpha_i &= 0 \quad if\ a_{C_i^1} = b_{C_i^1}
\end{aligned}$$

In case of $l = 1$, $R_j^2 = R_j$. If all the relations R^{S-1} of the $(S-1)^{th}$ biological threshold level are defined, then the relations R_j^S of the S^{th} threshold level with $(l > 1)$ can be defined by the following construct :

If $C_j^S \longleftrightarrow < C_1^{S-1}, C_2^{S-1}, \ldots, C_l^{S-1}, >$, then

$$a_{C_j^S} R_{bC_j^S}^S \Longleftrightarrow f_j^S(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_l) = 1 \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_i &= +1 \quad if\ a_{C_i^{S-1}} R_i^{S-1} b_{C_i^{S-1}} \\
\alpha_i &= -1 \quad if\ a_{C_i^{S-1}} \overline{R^{S-1}} b_{C_i^{S-1}} \\
\alpha_i &= 0 \quad if\ a_{C_i^{S-1}} = b_{C_i^{S-1}}
\end{aligned}$$

If $C^S = C^{S-1}$, then $R^S = R^{S-1}$; in other words the construction requires the relation R to coincide with R^r, which is a single relation at the r^{th} upper level.

To describe the entire bottom-up paradigm of description of interaction scheme between biological contexts, we consider an example where we describe the contextual constraints on the active site of an enzyme in simplistic terms. Without any loss of generality, we consider the the threshold level representing proteins

to be the root level in this case. The goal of the system (F) for the present purpose is to make the enzyme functional. We assume the elementary contexts that can influence functionality of the enzyme active site to be represented with 3 basic partitions; namely, first, the contextual differences originating out of internal coordinates; second, contextual differences arising out of interaction profile of the active site atoms with water; and third, contextual differences arising out of the capability of the active site to undergo a shape change. Hence we describe the family of partitions C, as $C^1 =< \{1,2,3\}, \{4,5\}, \{6\} >$ and $C^2 =< J >$; where element 1 denotes (possible) contextual difference arising out of the fluctuation of bond lengths, element 2 denotes (possible) contextual difference arising out of the fluctuation of bond angles, element 3 denotes (possible) contextual difference arising out of the fluctuation of torsion angles. Similarly, element 4 stands for (possible) contextual difference arising out of the hydrophobicity of active site patch, element 5 denotes the (possible) contextual difference arising out of the local electrostatic profile of the active site patch. Element 6 denotes the extent of (possible) contextual difference arising out of the change in the local shape of the active site patch. Denoting the set $\{1,2,3\}$ as D_1^2, $\{4,5\}$ as D_2^2 and $\{6\}$ as D_3^2, the hierarchic nature of these contextual dependencies can easily be described as :

$D_2 R D_1 \Longleftrightarrow [D_2 \geq D_1]$

similarly,

$D_3 R D_2 \Longleftrightarrow [D_3 \geq D_2]$ and $D_3 R D_1 \Longleftrightarrow [D_3 \geq D_1]$

Implying that a (possible) contextual difference arising out of the hydrophobicity of active site patch, or a (possible) contextual difference due to the local electrostatic profile of the active site patch will surely account for some change in the distribution profile of bond length, bond angle and torsion angle distribution. But the vice-verse of the case described, viz., a change in the local electrostatics

profile and local hydrophobic profile due to a change in bond-length, bond-angle or torsion angle might or might not be observed in reality. Similarly, in case of a possible change in local shape the local electrostatic profile, local hydrophobicity profile, local distribution of bond-length, bond-angle, torsion angle will surely be taking place; but the other way round might or might not be observed. This vindicates and generalizes our previous finding that interactions between biological contexts, are transitive but are not commutative (hence, if D_2RD_1 and D_3RD_2 are defined, $D_3RD_2RD_1$ can be defined; but merely because D_3RD_2 exists doesn't imply that D_2RD_3 exists too).

While framework of eq^ns $[1-5]$ along with examples 1 and 2 describe the nature of multilevel organization of CT, such description is 'bottom-up' in nature. Hence, while it is helpful to describe the context-mapping between any two particular adjacent biological threshold levels levels $'l'$ and $'l+1'$, (say between threshold levels representing nucleotides and amino acids, amino acids and proteins, or between proteins and biochemical pathways, etc ..) the general mode of dependency within CT with a birds-eye ('top-down') view of the organization of it, can hardly be guessed from such bottom-up approach.

We start the construction of the top-down scheme of description of dependencies between biological contexts, by enlisting the assumptions involved therein. Hence :

Assumption-1) : In absence of random external disturbances and without a failure of any component belonging to physical structure of the system (P) all the rules of multilevel interactions between the contexts representing any biological threshold level, can be constructed and described in deterministic manner.

Success of recent attempts with deterministic modeling of various biological phenomena from diverse backgrounds [18-20] suggest that such assumption is not ill-founded, and that too in absence of possible perturbations.

Assumption-2) : The necessary and sufficient condition for the feasibility of these deterministic rules of inter-level context interactions, is whether they account for the accomplishment of certain biological goals (F) or not. Previous studies [8-10] vindicate such assumption.

Assumption-3) : Although biological systems will be exposed to randomly varying magnitudes of external parameters, the essence of the deterministic criteria of context interactions to accomplish the required biological function will not be perturbed by significant amount. This assumption implies that deterministic manner of context interactions will not be undergoing significant change when the magnitudes of components of underlying physical structures $\{p_i\}$ $(p_i \in P)$, comprised of relevant biological parameters, are altered within some allowable range. We describe this allowable range of assumed magnitude of some arbitrarily chosen parameter π by an interval $[\pi_0, \pi_1]$.

Relevance of this assumption comes into light when one analyzes the nature of some previous models. Since every biological property operates within a specified bound of magnitude, something that has been referred to as 'fluctuation' in an earlier study [15] the functions that represent them will also be bounded in their ranges. Examples for such fluctuation are many; in the biological threshold level representing cells, for the mitogen-activated protein kinase cascade studies, the total concentrations of MKKK, MKK and MAPK have been found to be in the range 10–1000 nm and the estimates for the kcat values of the protein kinases and phosphatases have been found to range from 0.01 to 1 s^{-1} [21]. Similarly, for the proteins, the mass fractal dimension representing compactness of the protein has been found to be in the range of 2.22 to 2.69 [22].

Based on these assumptions, we propose the functional that defines the probability of attaining the biological goal (F) under consideration, to assume the form :

$$F_0 = \int_{x_i \in S} \phi\left(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\right) dx_i \qquad (1 \leq i \leq n) \tag{6}$$

where ϕ is the probability density of attaining the objective (biological goal) and X is the feasibility domain of the contexts x_i.

Since to achieve every biological goal, many (say, m) successive stages of context interactions are required, we can express $eq^n - 6$ at a higher resolution as :

$$\phi\left(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\right) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} \phi_j | \phi_{j-1}\left(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\right) \tag{7}$$

where $\phi_j | \phi_{j-1}$ represent the conditional probability associated with context $\{x_i\}$ interactions, while attempting to achieve a particular biological goal.

However, since the individual physical parameters p_i ($p_i \in P$), upon which the contexts are working, may not always be strongly correlated and although related with each other, can be considered independent when viewed individually with respect to their functional contribution to the system. For example, the time-dependent and context-dependent fluctuations in individual bond-lengths, bond-angles and torsion-angles in the protein interior, although might be related in some intricate way to the resultant dipole moment for the protein; can

be considered, for all practical purposes, in terms of their individual (and not linked) contributions in ensuring proteins stability and functionality. Hence we attempt to partition the relevant contexts into a sum of disjoint domains; such that :
$(x_i \in X_i)$ and $\sum_i X_i = S$.

Considering this partition we can re-write $eq^n - 6$ as :

$$F_0 = \int_{x_1 \in X_1} \int_{x_2 \in X_2} .. \int_{x_n \in X_n} \phi_1 (x_1, x_2, .., x_n) \times \phi_{2|1} (x_1, x_2, .., x_n) .. \phi_{m|m-1} (x_1, x_2, .., x_n) \, dx_1 dx_2 .. dx_m \quad (8)$$

In other words, purely in terms of achievement of biological goals :

$$F_0 = F_1 F_{2|1} \ldots F_{m|m-1} \quad (9)$$

where

$$F_{j|j-1} = \int_{x_1 \in X_1} \int_{x_2 \in X_2} \ldots \int_{x_n \in X_n} \phi_{j|j-1} (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \, dx_1 dx_2 \ldots dx_n \quad (10)$$

are the conditional probabilities of context-interactions of the system realizing the successive stages of the task. It is necessary to mention here that to achieve any biological function, the domain of integration for every x_i in $eq^n - 8$ must be within their respective permissible range, say $[x_{\pi_0}, \ \ x_{\pi_1}]$.

While it is difficult to assume that every context-interaction necessary to realize certain biological goal will always be operating in deterministic manner

with perfect efficiency, experience teaches us that biological goals are seldom compromised with. Hence we assume that the reliability of any arbitrarily chosen context interaction at any arbitrarily chosen j^{th} state in the realization of certain biological function, is statistically independent of the probability of the realization of that particular biological function. In that case, the integrand in $eq^n - 10$, can be expressed as a product $\phi_{j|j-1}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)\, r_j(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$, where r_j,$(r_j \in R)$ describes the probability of reliability of any arbitrarily chosen context-interaction at j^{th} state in the realization of certain biological function.

Hence $eq^n - 7$, can be expressed more realistically as :

$$\phi(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) = \prod_{j=1}^{m} \phi_{j|j-1}(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)\, r_j(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \tag{11}$$

Thus, when the reliability of context-interactions are taken into account, assuming that $eq^n - 8$ and $eq^n - 10$ are valid, $eq^n - 6$ and $eq^n - 7$ can be re-written as :

$$F_0 = \prod_{j=1}^{m} F_j | F_{j-1} R_j \tag{12}$$

where

$$R_j = \int_{x_1 \in X_1} \int_{x_2 \in X_2} \ldots \int_{x_n \in X_n} r_j(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)\, dx_1 dx_2 \ldots dx_n \tag{13}$$

In other words, $eq^n - 12$, can be re-written as :

$$F_0 = F_1 F_{2|1} \dots F_{n|n-1} R_1 R_2 \dots R_m \tag{14}$$

Conclusion :

While $eq^n - 1$ to $eq^n - 5$ constructed the bottom-up scheme of describing the interactions and dependencies between biological contexts, the framework of equations $eq^n - 6$ to $eq^n - 14$ describe the top-down view of the same. Together these set of equations present a comprehensive way to quantitatively model the omnipresent "context-dependence" in biology. Evidences for the reliability of such mathematical treatise can easily be obtained from the various experimentally proved results that are provided to emphasize the reasonable nature of these formulations. Since contemporary biology, as never before, is attempting to be objective in its philosophy, the necessity of a mathematical model to describe the "context-dependent" nature of it can hardly be ignored. The model proposed here, therefore, assumes immense importance.

Acknowledgment : This work was supported by COE-DBT (Department of Biotechnology, Government of India) scholarship.

The author wants to thank professor Indira Ghosh, former Director, Bioinformatics centre, University of Pune along with Dr. Urmila Kulkarni-Kale, the present Director, Bioinformatics centre, University of Pune for providing him with an opportunity to work on a problem that has got nothing to do with his PhD degree.

References :

1) Siepel A. and Haussler D.; Phylogenetic Estimation of Context-Dependent Substitution Rates by Maximum Likelihood; Mol. Biol. Evol. 21(3):468-488. 2004

2) Zhang W., Bouffard G., Wallace S., and Bond J; Estimation of DNA Sequence Context-dependent Mutation Rates Using Primate Genomic Sequences; Journal of Molecular Evolution; Volume 65, 207-214, 2007.

3) Main E.R.G., Fulton K.F, and Jackson S.E.; Context-Dependent Nature of Destabilizing Mutations on the Stability of FKBP12; Biochemistry, 1998, 37 (17), 6145–6153.

4) Hagan I., and Sharrocks A. D.; Understanding cancer: from the gene to the organism Conference on genes and cancer; EMBO Rep.; 2002; May 15; 3(5): 415–419.

5) Jablonski P.G., Lee S.D., and Jerzak L.; Innate plasticity of a predatory behavior: nonlearned context dependence of avian flush-displays; Behavioral Ecology 2006 17(6):925-932.

6) Andrianantoandro E., Basu S., Karig D.K., and Weiss R.; Synthetic biology: new engineering rules for an emerging discipline; Mol Syst Biol. 2006; 2: 2006.0028.

7) Gopalacharyulu P.V., Lindfors E., Bounsaythip C. and Oresic M; Context dependent visualization of protein function, Proceedings of Probabilistic Modelling and Machine Learning in Structural and Systems Biology Workshop (Rousu, J., Kaski, S., and Ukkonen, E. eds.), 2006, 26-31.

8) Yartseva A., Klaudel H., Devillers R., and Kepes F., Incremental and unifying modelling formalism for biological interaction networks; BMC Bioinformat-

ics 2007, 8:433.

9) Troyanskaya O.G., Dolinski K., Owen A.B., Altman R.B., and Botstein D.; A Bayesian framework for combining heterogeneous data sources for gene function prediction (in Saccharomyces cerevisiae); PNAS July 8, 2003 vol. 100 no. 14, 8348 – 8353.

10) Camon E., Magrane M., Barrell D., Lee V., Dimmer E., Maslen J., Binns D., Harte N., Lopez R., and Apweiler R.; The gene ontology annotation (goa) database: sharing knowledge in uniprot with gene ontology, Nucl. Acids Res. 32 (2004) 262–266.

11) Weisstein, E.W., "Incidence Matrix." - MathWorld-A Wolfram Web Resource. http://mathworld.wolfram.com/IncidenceMatrix.html

12) Boeckmann B, Blatter M.C., Famiglietti L., Hinz U., Lane L., Roechert B., Bairoch A.; Protein variety and functional diversity: Swiss-Prot annotation in its biological context; C. R. Biologies 328 (2005) 882–899.

13) Duncan J.E., Goldstein L.S.B.; The Genetics of Axonal Transport and Axonal Transport Disorders; PLoS Genetics, Volume 2, 1275-1284; 2006.

14) Banerji, A., Existence of biological uncertainty principle implies that we can never find 'THE' measure for biological complexity., To be published.

15) Testa, B., and Kier, L., 2000. Emergence and Dissolvence in the Self-organisation of Complex Systems. Entropy. 2, 1-25.

16) Dhar, P., 2007. The next step in biology: A periodic table? J. Biosci. 32, 1005–1008.

17) Haseltine, E.L., and Arnold F.H.,; Synthetic Gene Circuits: Design with Directed Evolution; Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biomol. Struct. 2007.36:1-19.

18) Janda J., and Gegina G.; A deterministic model for the processing and presentation of bacteria-derived antigenic peptides; Journal of Theoretical Biology; 250(3), 532-546. 2008.

19) Kim M., Maly I.V., Deterministic Mechanical Model of T-Killer Cell Polarization Reproduces the Wandering of Aim between Simultaneously Engaged Targets; PLoS Comput .Biol.; 5(1),1-12, 2009.

20) Ferreira P.G., and Azevedo P.J.; Evaluating deterministic motif significance measures in protein databases; Algorithms for Mol. Biol., 2007, 2:16

21) Kholodenko, B., 2000. Negative feedback and ultrasensitivity can bring about oscillations in the mitogen-activated protein kinase cascades. Eur. J. Biochem. 267(6), 1583–1588.

22) Enright, M.B., Leitner, D.M., 2005. Mass fractal dimension and the compactness of proteins. Phys. Rev. E., 71, 011912.